1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
789	WESTERN DISTRIC	DISTRICT COURT T OF WASHINGTON COMA
10	BRIAN A ALVES,	
11	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. 2:15-CV-01624-DWC
12	v.	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT TO
13	NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,	42 U.S.C. § 406(b)
14 15	Defendant.	
16	Presently before the Court is Plaintiff Bri	an A. Alves' Motion for Attorney's Fees
17	Discount to 42 H C C \$ 406(h) Dist 22 Discount to 29 H C C \$ 626(a) Federal Dula of Civil	
18	Procedure 73 and Local Rule MJR 13, the parties have consented to have this matter heard by the	
19	undersigned Magistrate Judge. See Dkt. 7.	
20	Under 42 U.S.C. § 406(b), the Court may	allow a reasonable fee for an attorney who
21	represented a Social Security Title II claimant be	efore the Court and obtained a favorable
22	judgment, as long as such fee is not in excess of	25% of the total past-due benefits. See
23	Grisbrecht v. Barnhart, 535 U.S. 789 (2002). WI	hen a contingency agreement applies, the Court
24	will look first to such agreement and will conduc	et an independent review to assure the

1	reasonableness of the fee requested, taking into consideration the character of the representation
2	and results achieved. See Grisbrecht, 535 U.S. at 807, 808. Although the fee agreement is the
3	primary means for determining the fee, the Court may reduce the fee for substandard
4	representation, delay by the attorney, or because a windfall would result from the requested fee.
5	See Crawford v. Astrue, 586 F.3d 1142, 1151 (9th Cir. 2009) (citing Grisbrecht, 535 U.S. at
6	808).
7	Here, Plaintiff signed a contingency fee agreement agreeing to pay his attorney a fee
8	equal to 25% of the his past-due benefits. See Dkt. 28-4. The representation was not substandard
9	and the results achieved were excellent. See Dkt. 20, 28-3; Grisbrecht, 535 U.S. at 808. This
10	Court reversed and remanded this matter to the Administration for further proceedings and,
11	following remand and a second hearing, Plaintiff was awarded benefits. See Dkt. 20, 28-3. There
12	is no evidence of an excessive delay by the attorney or that a windfall will result from the
13	requested fee. Further, Defendant does not object to the requested fee. Dkt. 29.
14	Plaintiff moves for attorney's fees in the amount of \$21,830.50, which is 25% of
15	Plaintiff's total past-due benefits. See Dkt. 28-3. Previously, Plaintiff was awarded an attorney
16	fee of \$ 12,278.17 ¹ under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"). See Dkt. 25, 28-2. ²
17	Therefore, Plaintiff is moving for a net attorney's fee award of \$ 9,552.33. Based on Plaintiff's
18	Motion and supporting documents (Dkt. 28, 28-2, 28-3, 28-4, 28-5, 28-6), and Defendant does
19	not object to the requested fee (Dkt. 29), the Court orders attorney's fees in the amount of
20	
2122	¹ The Court notes Plaintiff received an EAJA award of \$ 7,294.40 in this case, <i>see</i> Dkt. 25, and an EAJA award of \$ 4,983.77 in <i>Alves v. Colvin</i> , 2:14-cv-478-MJP-JPD (Dkt. 25). Plaintiff has therefore received a total EAJA award for work related to this action of \$ 11,022.32. <i>See Parrish v. Commissioner of Social Security</i> , 698 F.3d 1215, 1221 (9th Cir. 2012) (holding that the court must offset all EAJA awards against the \$ 406(b) award).

23

² Plaintiff states he received an EAJA award of \$ 6,038.55 on September 1, 2016 in this case. *See* Dkt. 28. However, on September 2, 2016, the Court entered an Amended Order awarding Plaintiff EAJA fees in the amount of \$ 7,294.40. Dkt. 25. Therefore, the Court finds Plaintiff was awarded \$ 7,294.40 in this case, not \$ 6,038.55.

1	\$9,552.33, minus any applicable processing fees as allowed by statute, be awarded to Plaintiff's
2	attorney pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 406(b). After paying the attorney's fee, the Social Security
3	Administration shall release all remaining funds directly to Plaintiff.
4	Dated this 20th day of March, 2018.
5	
6	1 XW Chustel
7	David W. Christel United States Magistrate Judge
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	